UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/677,493	10/02/2000	Guang Yang		3562

7590   09/12/2009

George Guang Yang
392 Hans Way
San Jose, CA 95133

EXAMINER
TO, BAOQUOC N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

_____

Ex parte GUANG YANG

_____

Appeal 2009-001164
Application 09/677,493
Technology Center 2100

_____

Decided: September 14, 2009

_____

Before LANCE LEONARD BARRY, JOHN A. JEFFERY, and
THU A. DANG, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

JEFFERY, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the Examiner's
rejection of claims 1-7. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b). We
affirm-in-part.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant invented a relational database integrated with a data editing system. A graphical user interface (GUI) provides tools to modify and edit text and other data (e.g., image, audio, and video).[1] Independent claim 1 is reproduced below:

1. An integrated relational database data editing system providing a visual environment, graphic user interfaces and tools in a client computer to remotely access a server computer that contains a relational database and to manage and edit said database data contents through either intranet or Internet, and said system includes the following mechanisms and characters:

(i)   said client computer retrieves the database data from the remote server computer database, modifies, updates, input, output the data and then sends the data back to the original database; and

(ii)   said client computer directly edits and modifies the database data without writing detail computer language codes in an efficient and easy-to-use manner; and

(iii)   said client computer directly edits and modifies the large text data type and large binary data type by using a plurality of commercial text and multimedia data editors installed on the client computer; and

(iv)   said database data editing system uses TCP/IP (Transfer Control Protocol/Internet Protocol) based connection-oriented network protocols to communicate between the client and server computers; and

(v)   said database data editing system implements user authentication and access control mechanisms which assign different user groups with different privileges.

---

[1] *See generally* Spec. 1 and 2; Figs. 1 and 3.

The Examiner relies upon the following as evidence in support of the rejection:

Moursund	US 5,644,739	July 1, 1997
Koppolu	US 5,801,701	Sep. 1, 1998
Teper	US 5,815,665	Sep. 29, 1998
Gill	US 6,005,560	Dec. 21, 1999
Allport	US 6,104,334	Aug. 15, 2000
Bowman-Amuah	US 6,256,773 B1	July 3, 2001 (field Aug. 31, 1999)

(1) Claims 1 and 6[2] stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport. Ans. 4-7

(2) Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill, Bowman-Amuah, Allport, and Koppolu. Ans. 7, 8, and 9-11.

(3) Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill, Bowman-Amuah, Allport, Koppolu, and Moursund. Ans. 8-9.

(4) Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill, Bowman-Amuah, Allport, and Teper. Ans. 11-12.

---

[2] The Examiner mistakenly includes claim 4, which depends from claim 3, in this rejection. As claim 3 is rejected using Koppolu, claim 4 should be included with the obviousness rejection of claim 3. Since the Examiner relies on Gill to reject claim 4 and Gill forms part of the rejection of claim 3, we find this error to be harmless.

Rather than repeat the arguments of Appellant or the Examiner, we refer to the Briefs and the Answer[3] for their respective details. In this decision, we have considered only those arguments actually made by Appellant. Arguments, which Appellant could have made but did not make in the Briefs, have not been considered and are deemed to be waived. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

As a preliminary matter, we will not consider Appellant's assertions that claims 1-7 have proper antecedent basis. App. Br. 2, 3, 13, and 14. Such issues are petitionable matters under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 and will not be addressed on appeal. *See* MPEP § 1207.03(IV).

We next consider Appellant's argument related to the prior art rejections presented by the Examiner. Appellant argues each claim separately. App. Br. 3-13 and 14-25; Reply Br. 3-24. Accordingly, each claim will be addressed separately.

OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OVER GILL, BOWMAN-AMUAH, AND ALLPORT

Claim 1

The Examiner finds that Gill teaches all the recited elements of independent claim 1, except for a database data editing system that implements a "user authentication and access control mechanisms which assign different user groups with different privileges" and the editing system edits content stored in the relational database. Ans. 4-5. The Examiner finds that both Gill's discussion of the project coordinator's ability to control

---

[3] Throughout this opinion, we refer to (1) the Appeal Brief filed January 15, 2008 and supplemented on March 4, 2008; (2) the Examiner's Answer mailed May 28, 2008; and (3) the Reply Brief filed June 24, 2008.

access privileges of staff members and Bowman-Amuah's discussion of controlling access right by groups teaches a combined Gill/Bowman-Amuah editing system that includes the controlling access by groups in order to limit the number of people who can access to specific data. Ans. 5-6. The Examiner further relies on Allport's teaching of a relational database that has editing abilities to provide a reason to modify Gill's database so as to allow data to be organized in a table and edited more conveniently. Ans. 6-7.

Appellant argues that: (1) Gill does not disclose or teach a relational database or a server with a relational database; (2) Gill fails to indicate what the file server, user interface, and text editor are; (3) Gill fails to teach a client computer that retrieves data from a remote server and edits and modifies database data; (4) Gill fails to teach the editing system uses TCP/IP protocol; (5) Gill does not relate to securing an integrated database editing system has a user authentication and access mechanism which assigns different user groups with different privileges; and (5) neither Allport nor Bowman-Amuah relate to an integrated database editing system. App. Br. 3-9 and 14-18; Reply Br. 3-6.

ISSUES

The following issues have been raised in the present appeal:

(1) Has Appellant shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport collectively teach or suggest an integrated relational database data editing system that includes a client computer accessing, editing, and modifying database data from a remote server computer database?

(2) Has Appellant shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport collectively teach or suggest a database editing system that uses TCP/IP based connection-oriented network protocols to communicate between the client and server?

(3) Has Appellant shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport collectively teach or suggest the database data editing system uses a user authentication and access control mechanism that assigns different user groups with different privileges?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The record supports the following findings of fact (FF) by a preponderance of the evidence.

Gill

1. Gill discloses a multi-media project management system that includes different databases for storing multi-media object data and other information, such as text and graphics. Col. 1, ll. 29-42 and Col. 2, ll. 34-51.

2. Gill discloses a client/server software architecture between a project coordinator 24 and staff members (e.g., project designer and designer/editor). Gill discloses the multi-media presentation generation (MPG) system used by the client includes a processor and display has an editing unit 52, and that data is transferred among a network of interconnected processors used by staff members. Col. 2, ll. 2-5, col. 4, ll. 13-51, col. 12, ll. 1-15, and col. 15, ll. 17-48; Figs. 1, 2, 4, and 5.

6

3. Gill states the staff member gains access to the multi-media object files stored on the database on the server through a multi-media presentation access controller 320 that includes a check-in and check-out procedure where the project coordinator 24 gives staff members access privileges to different multi-media objects by validating logon names and passwords. Col. 2, ll. 46-51, col. 4, ll. 17-22, and col. 8, ll. 1-3 and 46-62.

4. Gill discloses the staff members can access, modify, and update the multi-media object files and that the updated data is sent back to the repository on the server. Gill, col. 4, l. 43-col. 5, l. 33, col. 6, ll. 14- col. 7, l. 54, and col. 9, l. 67 – col. 10, l. 27.

5. Gill discloses data communication connections S4 to broadcast media, such the Internet. Col. 12, ll. 57-66.

Allport

6. Allport teaches an Internet-enabled controller that includes a consumer-friendly relational database of entries that can be navigated and edited. Col. 7, l. 49-col. 8, l. 29 and col. 24, ll. 27-31.

Bowman-Amuah

7. Bowman-Amuah teaches common techniques for controlling access to a repository includes grouping users and assigning different access rights to the group. The groups are also assigned specific read/write/delete/modify authority. Col. 53, ll. 23-29.

8. Bowman-Amuah also teaches a known transport protocol includes TCP. Col. 133, ll. 13-14.

Appellant's Specification

9. The Background of the Invention section of the Specification lists Oracle and IBM DB2 as common relational databases that support text and multimedia data. Spec. 1:29.

10. The Specification states the invention is directed toward permitting editing database data in an efficient and easy-to-use manner. Spec. 2:15-17.

PRINCIPLES OF LAW

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, it is incumbent upon the Examiner to establish a factual basis to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In so doing, the Examiner must make the factual determinations set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966) (noting that 35 U.S.C. § 103 leads to three basic factual inquiries: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue; and (3) the level of ordinary skill in the art. The Examiner's obviousness rejection must be based on:

> "some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness" . . . . [H]owever, the analysis need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ.

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 550 U.S. 398, 418 (2007) (quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).

"The motivation [to combine references] need not be found in the references sought to be combined, but may be found in any number of sources, including common knowledge, the prior art as a whole, or the nature of the problem itself." *DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (citation omitted).

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

"The analogous-art test requires that the Board show that a reference is either in the field of the applicant's endeavor or is reasonably pertinent to the problem with which the inventor was concerned in order to rely on that reference as a basis for rejection." *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 986-87 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (citing *Oetiker,* 977 F.2d at 1447).

ANALYSIS

We find no error in the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 based on Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport. Appellant argues that Gill does not disclose, teach, or suggest a relational database. Preliminarily, we note that while claim 1 recites a "relational database data editing system" in the preamble, the claim does not recite the relational database in the body of the claim, but only "the database data." Nonetheless, Appellant cannot show nonobviousness by attacking Gill individually where the rejections are based on Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport. *Merck*, 800 F.2d at 1097.

Gill teaches a system that includes different databases for storing multi-media object data and other information. FF 1. We acknowledge that the Examiner's position that Gill suggests a relational database (Ans. 6 and 12) is problematic. Nonetheless, Allport has also been cited to teach that relational databases are used to navigate and edit various features of data in an organized and convenient way. FF 6. Moreover, Appellant lists in the Background of the Invention section of the Specification some common relational databases that support text and multimedia data. FF 9. This disclosure evidences that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have recognized that multi-media objects or data would commonly be stored within relational databases. *See DyStar*, 464 F.3d at 1361. Thus, considering the evidence of record as a whole, the teachings and common knowledge of skilled artisans reasonably suggest combining Allport's teachings with Gill to yield the predictable result of using a relational database for Gill's data that is more organized and convenient to edit and navigate. *See KSR*, 550 U.S. at 416.

Appellant also challenges that Allport is non-analogous art since "Allport does not teach anything related to the integrated database editing system." App. Br. 5. While Allport is not in the same field of endeavor as Appellant's invention, we find that the Allport is reasonably pertinent to the problem with which the inventor was concerned. *See Kahn*, 441 F.3d at 986-87. That is, both are concerned with organizing data in a system that stores data in databases in an efficient and consumer-friendly manner. *Compare* FF 6 *with* FF 10.

Additionally, contrary to Appellant's assertions (App. Br. 15), Gill discloses an editing database system that includes a client computer that edits and modifies database data. Gill discloses a client/server relationship

10

between a project coordinator 24 and staff members (e.g., project designer and designer/editor). FF 2. Gill further discloses that the different staff members can communicate through a network of processors. *Id.* Thus, Gill's server processor (i.e., associated with the project coordinator) is remote from the client's processor (i.e., associated with the designer/editor). Moreover, once a staff member gains access to the multi-media object files stored on the database on the server (FF 3), the staff member using the client computer can access, modify, and update the data on the database. FF 4. Gill also discloses sending the updated data back to the original database. *Id.* Finally, we refer to our previous discussion of Gill and Allport for limitations calling for "the database data." Thus, Gill and Allport collectively teach or suggest an integrated relational database data editing system that includes a client computer accessing, editing, and modifying database data from a remote server computer database.

Appellant also argues that Gill does not disclose a TCP/IP protocol being used to communicate between client and server. App. Br. 16. While Gill does not explicitly disclose what connection protocol is used between the client and server, Gill does disclose data communication connections S4 to the Internet. FF 5. Additionally, TCP/IP protocol is a transport protocol used in Internet connections that is known by ordinarily skilled artisans. *See* FF 8. Thus, based on the common knowledge that the TCP is a commonly used transport protocol over the Internet, an ordinarily skilled artisan would similarly appreciate using this teaching to include the TCP/IP protocol between client and server in Gill's system. *See DyStar*, 464 F.3d at 1361.

Appellant admits that Gill teaches an access controller that controls staff member's access (*see also* FF 2), and that Bowman-Amuah teaches common techniques for controlling access is to group users and assign different access rights to the group (*see also* FF 7). *See* App. Br. 8. Nonetheless, Appellant contends that the combined Gill and Bowman-Amuah system does not teach a database editing system that includes user authentication and access control mechanisms which assigns different user groups with different privileges. App. Br. 8, 9, 16, and 17. As stated above, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. *Merck*, 800 F.2d at 1097. Combining Bowman-Amuah's teaching related to controlling access by groups with Gill's recognition of controlling individual staff members would predictably result in giving certain group of staff members (e.g., designer/editor or project designer) different access privileges to the data depending on their job.

Lastly, claim 1 does not recite a user interface (App. Br. 15), nor does the claim recite the particular details pertaining to file server and editing system that are alleged to be missing from the cited prior art (*Id.*) We will therefore not address these arguments further since they are not commensurate with the scope of claim 1.

For the above reasons, we will sustain the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 6

Claim 6 recites the client/server version is implemented using Java technologies and deployed to the intranet. The Examiner relies on Gill's discussion in column 12, lines 57 through 67 to teach this limitation. Ans. 7.

12

Appellant argues that the Gill does not teach the limitations in claim 6. App. Br. 7, 18, and 19; Reply Br. 7-8.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

The additional following issue has been raised:

(4) Has Appellant shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 6 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill discloses the client computer and server implement Java technologies?

ANALYSIS

We find error in the Examiner's rejection of claim 6. A review of the portion of Gill relied upon by the Examiner discusses data being downloaded to the server using the Internet or other media sources. *See* FF 5. There is no discussion of using Java technologies. While this technology may be known, the Examiner has not presented such evidence and, thus, has not established a prima facie case to support a legal conclusion of obviousness. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d at 1073. Moreover, the Examiner has not established that the client/server relationship taught by Gill implements Java technologies as recited in claim 6.

For the above reasons, Appellant has shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport.

OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OVER GILL, BOWMAN-AMUAH,
ALLPORT, AND KOPPOLU

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and recites, in pertinent part, (1) a GUI
that displays a database table; (2) the database data on each table cell
contains a small icon as place-holder; and (3) the commercial data editor is
popped up from the client computer when clicking on the small icon of the
table cell. The Examiner finds the combination of Gill and Koppolu teaches
this limitation, particularly: (1) Gill's discussion of a data editor that pops up
after double-clicking a small icon of the table cell (Ans. 10), and (2)
Koppolu's Figure 4 and discussion of an embedded spreadsheet that can be
edited by selecting a cell. Ans. 10-11. Appellant argues that: (1) Koppolu
only allows for direct editing of a spreadsheet object in a word processing
application, and (2) the combination of Gill and Koppolu does not teach a
data editor that is popped up when the small icon of a table cell is double-
clicked. App. Br. 11 and 21-23; Reply Br. 10-12.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and recites a database data manager in
the client computer comprising a header panel and a detail panel. The
Examiner finds that Koppolu teaches a database manager with the claim
features and a rationale for combining the teaching with Gill, Bowman-
Amuah, and Allport. Ans. 7-8. Appellant argues that: (1) Koppolu does not
relate to a database data manager having a header and detail panel; (2) is
different from claim 3; and (3) cannot be combined with Gill, Bowman-
Amuah, and Allport. App. Br. 10, 11, 19, and 20; Reply Br. 8-9.

Claim 4 depends from claim 3 and recites that (1) the database data manager contains a list of databases and database tables for each database, the detail panel pops up when double-clicking the database name; and (3) the database table pops up when double-clicking the table name. The Examiner finds that Koppolu[4] teaches these limitations. Ans. 7. Appellant argues that Koppolu does not disclose a database table that pops up when clicking the table name. App. Br. 9 and 18; Reply Br. 7.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

The following additional issues have been raised:

(5) Has Appellant shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 2 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill, Bowman-Amuah, Allport, and Koppolu collectively teach the table cell of a table database contains a small icon as a place holder and the editor is popped up when the small icon is selected?

(6) Has Appellant shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 3 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill, Bowman-Amuah, Allport, and Koppolu collectively teach a database data manager with a header and detail panel?

(7) Has Appellant shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 4 under § 103(a) by finding that Koppolu teaches a database data manager with a list of databases and database tables and the database table pops up when a table name is selected?

---

[4] The Examiner mistakenly refers to Gill. Ans. 7. However, there is no Figure 32 in Gill, and we will presume the Examiner intended to state Koppolu.

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS OF FACT

The record supports the following additional findings of fact (FF) by a preponderance of the evidence.

Gill

11. Gill discloses the multi-media objects include pop-up menus and windows. Col. 8, ll. 46-50.

Koppolu

12. Koppolu discloses a main application window 3201 that includes a form object 3204 having project icon control objects 3213-3215 (i.e., VAC1-VAC3) and another form object 3205 that contains control objects including drop-down lists (e.g., 3206 and 3207) that provide data or information about the selected control object. Col. 42, l. 54 - col. 43, l. 5; Fig. 32.

13. Koppolu disclose the main application window 3201 permits the user to select a form object 3204 (e.g., VAC1) to generate a Microsoft Excel worksheet with an embedded spreadsheet object 405. The spreadsheet object 405 includes cells with data can be edited using the spreadsheet selection cursor 408. Col. 8, ll. 25-46 and col. 42, l. 54 - col. 43, l. 65; Figs. 4 and 32.

ANALYSIS

Claim 2

We find error in the Examiner's rejection of claim 2. Gill discloses that pop-up menus do appear inside of an application (FF 11), but there is no

discussion that this application or cell, as Examiner construes it (Ans. 10), is not defaulted as read-only as claim 2 requires. *See* FF 11. Moreover, Koppolu teaches a main application window or user interface 3201 that allows a user to select a form object 3204 (e.g., VAC1) in order to generate a spreadsheet object or database table 405. FF 13. The cells may be read-only when first generated, but the table cells can then be selected for editing using a spreadsheet selection cursor 408. *Id.* However, Koppolu does not teach or suggest these table cells contain small icons as place holders. *See* FF 12-13. Thus, we are unable to find support for the Examiner's position that there is a suggestion in Koppolu of cell having a drop down menu or a small icon as a place holder for data. Ans. 10. Moreover, Koppolu fails to teach or suggest that an editor pops up when the table cell's small icon is selected as claim 2 requires.

For the above reasons, Appellant has shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill, Bowman-Amuah, Allport, and Koppolu.

Claim 3

We find no error in the Examiner's rejection of claim 3. Koppolu discloses a database manager that includes a form object 3204 or header panel, and another form object 2305 or detail panel that provides information about the selected control object 3213, 3214, or 3215 within the header panel. FF 12. Additionally, contrary to Appellant's assertion that the combination is not possible (App. Br. 20), the Examiner has reasonably articulated that an ordinarily skilled artisan would have combined Koppolu's teaching with Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport to provide a layout

structure that allows the user to visualize and select information for editing. Ans. 8. Thus, the Examiner has provided some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness based on combining Koppolu with Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport. *See KSR*, 550 U.S. at 418.

For the above reasons, Appellant has not shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill, Bowman-Amuah, Allport, and Koppolu.

Claim 4

We find error, however, in the Examiner's rejection of claim 4. The Examiner states that Koppolu teaches a header panel with a list of databases and database tables and that the database table pops up when the table name is selected. Ans. 7. While Koppolu discloses a list of form objects 3213-3215 or databases (e.g., VAC1-VAC2) in the header panel 3204, Koppolu does not also teach a list of database tables. *See* FF 12. Furthermore, Koppolu does not disclose a database table in the header panel pops up when double-clicking a table name. Koppolu's form objects 3213-3215 cannot read on both the list of databases and database tables. Moreover, the information in the form object or detail panel 3205 cannot fairly be read on a database table that is part of the header panel as claimed. *See id.*

For the above reasons, Appellant has shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill, Bowman-Amuah, Allport, and Koppolu.

OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OVER GILL, BOWMAN-AMUAH,
ALLPORT, KOPPOLU, MOURSUND

Claim 5 alternatively depends on claims 3 and 4 and additionally recites the database tables.[5] For the foregoing reasons discussed in connection with claim 4 and Koppolu, we will not sustain the rejection of claim 5 that depends from claim 3 or claim 4.

OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OVER GILL, BOWMAN-AMUAH,
ALLPORT, AND TEPER

Claim 7 recites the system's web version uses Java technologies. For the foregoing reasons discussed in connection with claim 6 and Java technologies, we will not sustain the rejection of claim 7.

CONCLUSIONS

(1) Appellant has not shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport collectively teach or suggest an integrated relational database data editing system that includes a client computer accessing, editing, and modifying database data from a remote server computer database.

---

[5] As the Examiner indicates (Final Rej. 12), claim 5/3 does not have antecedent basis for "the database tables."

(2) Appellant has not shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport collectively teach or suggest a database editing system that uses TCP/IP based connection-oriented network protocols to communicate between the client and server.

(3) Appellant has not shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill, Bowman-Amuah, and Allport collectively teach or suggest the database data editing system uses a user authentication and access control mechanism that assigns different user groups with different privileges.

(4) Appellant has shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 6 and 7 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill discloses the different versions of the editing system implements Java technologies.

(5) Appellant has shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 2 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill, Bowman-Amuah, Allport, and Koppolu collectively teach the table cell of a table database contains a small icon as a place holder and the editor is popped up when the small icon is selected.

(6) Appellant has not shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 3 under § 103(a) by finding that Gill, Bowman-Amuah, Allport, and Koppolu collectively teach a database data manager with a header and detail panel.

(7) Appellant has shown the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 4 and 5 under § 103(a) by finding that Koppolu teaches a database data manager with a list of databases and database tables and the database table pops up when a table name is selected.

DECISION

We will sustain the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 3. We will not, however, sustain the Examiner's rejection of claims 2 and 4-7.

No period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED-IN-PART

pgc

George Guang Yang
392 Hans Way
San Jose CA 95133